

+



3643

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork i	Reduction Act of 1995, no p	persons are required	to respond to a collection of info	rmation unless it disp	plays a valid OMB control number.	
			Application Number	09/695,531		
TRANSMITTAL			Filing Date	October 23, 2000		
FORM			First Named Inventor	YAMASHITA, THOMAS T.		
. 51(111			Group Art Unit	3643		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Croup vist Gint			
(15 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25		Examiner Name	GELLNER, JEFFREY L.			
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 12		Attorney Docket Number	YAMA-008			
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)						
Extension of T Express Aban Information Di Certified Copy Documents Response to N Incomplete Ap	Reply al s/declaration(s) Time Request donment Request sclosure Statement of Priority Vissing Parts/	Contact Cont	ing-related Papers n to Convert to a onal Application of Attorney, Revocation e of Correspondence	to Gro Appea of App Appea (Appea) Propri Status Other identi - Dec	Allowance Communication oup al Communication to Board peals and Interferences al Communication to Group al Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) ietary Information s Letter r Enclosure(s) (please iffy below): claration Under 37 C.F.R. 132 for Thomas Yamashita	
and 07 07 17 102 07 1100						
	0:0::=	TIDE OF ARE:	IOANT ATTORNEY OF	AOENT	*	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm BRET E. FIELD, Reg. No. 37,620				f		
Individual Name				<u> </u>	71	
Signature						
Date	Date April 4, 2002					
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING						
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail						
in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: April 4, 2002,						
Typed or printed name Martha Cisneros						
Signature Date April 4, 2002						

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take .2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patrick Manual Commission Typed or Printed Name Martha Cisneros Date Signature

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Address to: Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Attorney Docket	YAMA-008		
First Named Inventor	Thomas T. Yamashita		
Application Number	09/695,531		
Filing Date	October 23, 2000		
Group Art Unit	3643		
Examiner Name	Gellner, Jeffrey L.		
Title	Microbial Blend Compositions And Methods For Their Use		

Sir:

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated January 31, 2002 for which a threemonth period for response was given making this response due on or before April 31, 2001. In view of the remarks put forth below, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 have been examined and have been rejected.

APR 1 7 2002

RECEIVED

GROUP 3600

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1-20, the only claims pending in this application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 10-13, 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Reinbergen (WO 97/31879). The Applicant respectfully submits that the above cited reference does not anticipate claims 1-8, 10-13, 14 and 17-19.

Under current case law, a reference does not anticipate a claim unless "all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found within [that]...reference....There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of invention." Scripps Clinic v. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ2d 1671, 1672 (Fed. Cir. 1992).